

PATENT
PATENT APP. SER. NO. 10/532,176
ECLIPSE GROUP DOCKET NO. H109054USU (P03080)

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-26 are rejected. In the July 29, 2010 Final Office Action, the Examiner:

1. Rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Knobl et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0025376), in view of *Jutzi et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0095939).

In the October 13, 2010 Advisory Action, the Examiner re-affirmed the rejections.

Claims 1-26 stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 22 and 25 to recite subject matter already recited in claims 1 and 14. Specifically, claims 22 and 25 now recite that a plurality of digital television data streams are received by a plurality of television receiver modules in the digital television reception unit, and that the video data, audio data, and miscellaneous data are communicated on the network to a display connected to the network, and the miscellaneous data is communicated when requested. Claim 1 is a mere clarification of the previously recited claim language. No new matter is added.

As to the rejections, Applicants traverse. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

I. Response to Advisory Action

In the October 13, 2010 Advisory Action, the Examiner states:

Knobl et al teaches an optical network 1 connects together a plurality of assorted A/V appliances 2-7, wherein the appliances and term audio/visual relates to devices that output audio and/or video signals (Para. 0039). In addition control unit 12 processes the available A/V presentations from appliances 2-7 (Para. 0041 and 0044) which reads on claimed limitation "a television reception unit that processes a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data." The examiner equated [6,8,9] as plurality of television receiver modules each configured to receive one of a plurality of digital transmission signals. Wherein, television 6 and monitors 8 and 9 are configured to receive one of a plurality of digital transmission signals (i.e. Audio, video, program information) (Figures 1-2; Para. 0039, 0041 and 0044-45)."

The Examiner's argument is based on erroneously equating:

PATENT
PATENT APP. SER. NO. 10/532,176
ECLIPSE GROUP DOCKET NO. H109054USU (P03080)

- “control unit 12” in Knobl with “television reception unit” as recited in claim 1, and
- “television 6 and monitors 8 and 9” in Knobl with “a plurality of television receiver modules” as recited in claim 1.

First, claim 1 recited prior to the pending amendment “a television reception unit that processes a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data, the television reception unit *further comprising*: a plurality of television receiver modules... .” That is, the television reception unit *comprises* the plurality of television receiver modules. The examiner’s erroneous construction of “television reception unit” ignores the claim term “further comprising.” The Examiner may not ignore any claim terms in determining the meaning of any other claim term.

Second, the Examiner’s argument relies on a varying and incongruous meaning for “a digital transmission signal” that is clearly not intended nor supported by the claim language. Specifically, the Examiner states that the control unit processes audio and video signals from appliances 2-7, which includes a CD player 2, a radio 3, a Digital Audio Broadcasting 4, a cassette tape 5, a television 6, and a DVD 7, which relies on a conclusion that “digital transmission signal” is a CD player signal, a radio signal, a DAB signal, a cassette tape signal, a television signal and a DVD signal. All of these signals are communicated on and received by the controller over the network. The Examiner then states that the television and monitors are “a plurality of television receiver modules that receive one of a plurality of digital transmission signals,” even though only one type of signal is processed by the television receiver 6 in Knobl—a television signal (received over the air and not over the network), and only video signals are received by the monitors 8,9 over the network.

Claim 1 recites a “digital transmission signal *having* video, audio, and miscellaneous data.” In addition, the digital transmission signal is clearly received over the air at the television receiver modules, not from the network. Therefore, the digital transmission signals do not include CD player signals, radio signals, DAB signals, cassette tape signals, television signals and a DVD signals. Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly recite the meaning of “digital transmission signal.”

PATENT
PATENT APP. SER. NO. 10/532,176
ECLIPSE GROUP DOCKET NO. H109054USU (P03080)

Applicants respectfully submit that Knobl does not teach what the Examiner alleges, which is sufficient to establish that the Examiner has failed to show obviousness. The Examiner also has erroneously relied on Jutzi in combination with Knobl using internally inconsistent reasoning.

As demonstrated above, the Examiner argues that "digital transmission signal" includes a CD player signal, a radio signal, a DAB signal, a cassette tape signal, a television signal and a DVD signal. None of these signals include multiplexed video, audio and data portions, and the Examiner has not asserted that they do. If none of the alleged digital transmission signals contain multiplexed audio, video and data portions, there is no use for the demultiplexer for which the teaching of Jutzi was asserted. Jutzi teaches a digital broadcast signal distribution to clients in the context of a cable television or satellite television or over-the-air television broadcasting using network operating centers that separate the data from the audio and video television signals before distributing the signals to the clients. The demultiplexer in Jutzi has very little use in a mobile or home media system such as that taught by Knobl in which signals are received by a radio or a television, and the signals are not multiplexed to contain audio, video and data signals. Therefore, Knobl and Jutzi are not combinable.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. Applicants have included the arguments contained in the response to the Examiner's Final Office Action in this submission for an RCE for convenience.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Knobl et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0025376), in view of *Jutzi et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0095939). Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Knobl* nor *Jutzi*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in independent claims 1, 14, 22, and 25.

A. Claim 1

The Examiner responded to Applicants' previous argument stating that Applicants are attacking the references individually when a combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* has been asserted. Applicants respectfully disagree.

PATENT
PATENT APP. SER. NO. 10/532,176
ECLIPSE GROUP DOCKET NO. H109054USU (P03080)

The Examiner equates the recited "evaluation unit configured to receive miscellaneous data" with the *Knobl* control unit 12 that receives programming information and organizes it in classifications; then argues for a combination of *Knobl* with *Jutzi*. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's equating of the "evaluation unit" with the *Knobl* control unit. If *Knobl* does not teach what the Examiner argues it teaches, then the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* do not obviate claim 1.

Nevertheless, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* also fails because *Knobl* does not teach or suggest "a television reception unit having: a plurality of television receiver modules" as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner argued with respect to claim 1 that:

Regarding claim 1, *Knobl et al.* teaches a digital television system in a vehicle (Figure 1) comprising: ...

a television reception unit [6, 14, 15] that processes a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data, the television reception unit further comprising:

a plurality of television receiver module [6, 8, 9] each configured to receive one of a plurality of digital transmission signals (Figure 1, Paragraphs 0039, 0041); ...

Knobl shows a TV (No. 6 in FIG. 1). However, *Knobl* fails to provide any teaching that the TV 6 processes a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data. Ref. Nos. 14 and 15 in FIG. 1 of *Knobl* are not television reception units. Ref. Nos. 14 and 15 are operating units, which are used as user controllers to control the program being played. See *Knobl* FIGs. 3-5, and do not "process a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data."

The TV 6 in *Knobl* (FIG. 1) also does not include a plurality of television receiver modules. *Knobl* fails to provide any teaching of the capabilities of the TV 6. Ref. Nos. 8 and 9 are not television receiver modules. Ref. Nos. 8 and 9 are monitors that do not process a digital transmission signal having audio, video and miscellaneous data. Monitors 8 and 9 process only video data.

Claim 1 recites that a display, an operating unit and a television reception unit communicate over a network. The television reception unit includes the plurality of television

PATENT
PATENT APP. SER. NO. 10/532,176
ECLIPSE GROUP DOCKET NO. H109054USU (P03080)

receiver modules and processes the digital transmission signals received by the television receiver modules to transmit the audio, video and miscellaneous data contained in the digital transmission signals over the network. The Examiner argued that the plurality of television receiver modules (being 6, 8, and 9) are connected by a network, which violates the wording of claim 1.

Knobl does not teach a television reception unit having a plurality of television receiver modules as recited in claim 1. The Examiner argued that *Knobl* teaches such a television reception unit in asserting the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi*. Therefore, the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, the television reception unit as recited in claim 1.

B. Claim 14

Claim 14 the digital television reception unit limitation of the system in claim 1 as an independent claim. Claim 14 recites that the digital television reception unit comprises a plurality of digital television reception modules. Therefore, the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, the television reception unit as recited in claim 14.

C. Claims 22 and 25

Claim 22 is a method claim for a method for receiving digital television signals in a mobile digital television reception system. Claim 25 is a means-plus-function claim reciting a digital television reception unit. Claim 22 has been amended to recite that the "plurality of digital data streams comprising coded and compressed television signals at a plurality of television receiver modules in a television receiver unit connected to a network." Claim 25 is a digital television reception unit comprising means for receiving a plurality of data streams of digital television signals.

Claims 22 and 25 have also been amended to clarify that the audio data, video data, and miscellaneous data are transmitted over the network to a display connected to the network, and that the miscellaneous data is communicated in response to a request for the miscellaneous data.

Therefore, the combination of *Knobl* and *Jutzi* does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, the method for receiving digital television signals or the television reception unit as

PATENT
PATENT APP. SER. NO. 10/532,176
ECLIPSE GROUP DOCKET NO. H109054USU (P03080)

recited in claim 22 and 25, respectively.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Independent claims 1, 14, 22, and 25 are not obvious over *Knobl* in view of *Jutzi*. Therefore, claims 2-13, which are dependent on claim 1; claims 15-21, which are dependent on claim 14; claims 23-24, which are dependent on claim 22; and claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25 are also allowable for the same reasons as claims 1, 14, 22, and 25.

NOV 29 2010

PATENT
PATENT APP. SER. NO. 10/532,176
ECLIPSE GROUP DOCKET NO. H109054USU (P03080)

CONCLUSION

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2542. A copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/29/10



Jennifer H. Hamilton
The Eclipse Group LLP
6345 Balboa Boulevard, Suite 325
Encino, CA 91316
(818) 488-8141 Telephone
(818) 332-4205 Fax
jhh@eclipsegrp.com

Customer No.: 34408

NOV 29 2010

PATENT
PATENT APP. SER. NO. 10/532,176
ECLIPSE GROUP DOCKET NO. H109054USU (P03080)


CONCLUSION

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2542. A copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/29/10


Jennifer H. Hamilton
The Eclipse Group LLP
6345 Balboa Boulevard, Suite 325
Encino, CA 91316
(818) 488-8141 Telephone
(818) 332-4205 Fax
jhh@eclipsegrp.com

Customer No.: 34408